DISCUSSION

* * *

Comment

E. F. EDINGER, *New York*

THESE papers on the problems arising in analytical training are stimulating and helpful. It is surely our duty to maintain a constant scrutiny of the psychological factors that are activated by and may interfere with the training process.

The New York group is just beginning to establish a well-structured training programme. Our experience is thus limited but we are keenly interested in the questions raised by these papers. As Dr. Plaut indicates, the trainee is in a different situation from other analytical patients because of his hope to be accepted as an analyst by the professional society. To achieve this goal, the all-important consideration is the recommendation of the candidate's personal analyst. The need for this recommendation may alter significantly the course of the trainee's analysis. Expression of unadapted attitudes and negative transference are likely to be avoided because the trainee, to a much greater extent than other patients, has objective reason to fear the disapproval of his analyst. This state of affairs is inherent in the training process and is apparently unavoidable. We can perhaps limit its effects by recognizing its existence.

I concur with the observations made by Kathleen Newton. The masochistic attitude of the candidate's ego towards the ideal of a "mature analyst" is something we see often. It can be considered as an identification with the shadow or inferior man and a failure to give suffering and inferiority feelings their proper, objective value as "the stone that the builders rejected". The analyst can be helpful in this situation by revealing at the suitable time some of his own conflicts and weaknesses. This begins the resolution of the transference and encourages an accepting rather than a masochistic attitude towards one's sense of inadequacy.

Mrs. Newton's remarks about the group interactions in seminars are very interesting. Some of us in New York are currently concerned with the possibility of making a group therapy experience part of the training for advanced candidates. We also believe that established analysts, members of the professional society, may find group therapy among themselves very

helpful in continuing their personal development and in maintaining rapport with their colleagues.

Dr. Fordham raises an important question concerning what supervised analysis should be and to what extent the candidate's counter-transference to his patients should be analysed by the supervisor. We in New York have not established a uniform policy about this. What I express here is thus only a personal opinion. If the supervisor is going to analyse, to some extent, the unconscious of the trainee, this would of course dilute the candidate's transference to his personal analyst. However, when the candidate has reached the stage in his training where he is ready for supervised analysis, is he not also ready for dilution and resolution of his transference? I would consider the opportunity for him to compare his personal analyst with his supervisor a fortunate one. This would lead, we hope, to the discovery of his own individual approach to psychotherapy which should not be identical either with that of his personal analyst or with that of his super sor. Since analysis is an art requiring the participation of the whole man, it is difficult to see how a supervision which carefully avoids the candidate's unconscious can be adequate. The rigid separation between what belongs to personal analysis and what belongs to supervision splits the candidate in two in just the place where he needs to be whole, namely, in his capacity to be a psychotherapist. In my opinion there is no need for a supervised analysis separate from personal analysis. These two functions are best performed within the framework of a single relationship. However, I do believe that there is a real need for the candidate to experience the personality and approach of more than one analyst. One way of doing this would be for the candidate who is entering supervised analysis to transfer his personal analysis to his supervisor. In some cases, however, this procedure would not fit the candidate's needs. In the final view, we are obliged to keep an open, flexible approach which is responsive to the individual needs of each trainee.

Reply to Dr. Edinger

MICHAEL FORDHAM, *London*

DR. EDINGER takes issue with the London Society's policy of instituting a supervisor who is not the analyst on the ground that it splits the candidate in two, and believes that dilution of the transference is indicated in that it helps in its resolution. These ideas require some reply, for, if true, they would certainly be a serious matter for the training in London. I believe, however, that there is room for discussion of Dr. Edinger's formulation.

The fact that a candidate goes to an analyst and to a supervisor cannot, in

Copyright of Journal of Analytical Psychology is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.